UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,843	08/29/2003	Richard L. Wilder	IGT1P277/P-798	8136

79646 7590 09/02/2008

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT
Attn: IGT
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER	
PANDYA, SUNIT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/651,843	WILDER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SUNIT PANDYA	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Response to Amendments

This action is in response to amendments filed by the applicant on April 14, 2008. Wherein the applicant has amended claims 1, 7 & 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itkis, and further in view of Vuong et al. (US Patent 5,762,552).

Claims 1-3, 9: Itkis teaches of a system configured to offer a wagering event to a player comprising a multiple gaming terminals, wherein each terminal contains a display to display wagering event information to the players (figure 1, wherein multiple wagering terminals with display for displaying wagering information are disclosed). Itkis also teaches each wagering terminal having a touch screen for player input (col. 1: 54-4), and a monetary/card interface to accept wager (figure 1 discloses card input for player tracking cards and all gaming terminal must definitely have a monetary input in order to activate the wagering terminal, i.e. a monetary input could be coin input, cash input, credit card input etc., further more Itkis' gaming machine contain processor which is in communications with each game component housed within the housing). Itkis teaches memory to store machine readable game codes and a single processor (the master computer in figure 1 device 1 contains a processor), which executes said codes to

offer games and bonuses related to the games to plurality of slave game device from a master game device (col. 3: 13-34).

Itkis however fails to teach of an audio interface having multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals. In an analogous art of Interactive network gaming, Vuong et al. teaches of having audio interface with multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals, and wherein the audio channels are located within the servers which contains a processor which routes the signals are required (col. 5: 24-34). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Itkis, to include an audio interface to allow for audio signals to be sent to multiple gaming terminals thus allowing players to experience unique sounds that synonymous with the games.

Claims 4-6, 8, 12-13, 16: Itkis teaches memory and processor being remote from the slave game terminals, wherein the processor controls multiple gaming terminals which are connected through a network (col. 3: 13-34, 3: 66-11).

Claims 7, 15 & 19: Itkis teaches master game device (Figure 1, element 1) that contains a memory to store machine readable game codes and a single processor (the master computer in figure 1 device 1 contains a processor) to execute said codes to offer games and bonuses related to the games to plurality of slave game device (col. 3: 13-34), and multiple gaming terminals to concurrently present wagering event to multiple players (figure 1, wherein multiple wagering terminals with display for displaying wagering information are disclosed, further more Itkis' gaming machine contain processor which is in communications with each game component housed within the housing). Itkis teaches of having communication interface

connected to the control module to send data to and receive data from the plurality of gaming terminals (col. 3: 66-11, 5: 15-32).

Itkis however fails to teach of an audio interface having multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals. In an analogous art of Interactive network gaming, Vuong et al. teaches of having audio interface with multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals, and wherein the audio channels are located within the servers which contains a processor which routes the signals are required (col. 5: 24-34). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Itkis, to include an audio interface to allow for audio signals to be sent to multiple gaming terminals thus allowing players to experience unique sounds that synonymous with the games.

Claims 10-11: Itkis teaches of master game device comprising a processor, a memory and additional expansion ports which could be used for video adapter as well as audio adapter (col. 3: 13-34, 5: 3-8).

Claims 17 & 20: Itkis teaches of a single controller controlling multiple wagering games (figure 2 master game device controlling the slave devices, col. 3: 13-34).

Claim 18: Itkis teaches wherein the control module could be a personal computer (figure 1) and each gaming terminal comprises a display and a player interface (see figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itkis and Vuong et al. as applied to claims 1-13 and 15-20 above, and further in view of Stepan et al. (US Patent 4,621,814).

Claim 14: The combination of Itkis and Vuong et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed however, Itkis and Vuong et al. fails to teach of having multiple gaming terminals within the same housing. Stepan teaches of an amusement device housing that allows multiple gaming devices to be placed in the same housing (see figure 1 and abstract). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Itkis and Vuong to allow multiple gaming devices to be placed in the same housing to reduce space being occupied by the multiple gaming machines.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/08 have been fully considered but they are moot on new ground of rejection.

Examiner Notes

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially

teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunit Pandya whose telephone number is (571)272-2823. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F: 7:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571)272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Robert E Pezzuto/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

SP